

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/075,209	02/14/2002	Christine Robert-Coutant	34364	7056
116 75	590 09/25/2002			
PEARNE & C	PEARNE & GORDON LLP 526 SUPERIOR AVENUE EAST SUITE 1200 EXAMINER CHURCH, CRAIG E		EXAMINER	
SUITE 1200			CRAIG E	
CLEVELAND,	OH 44114-1484		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2882	
			EXAMINER CHURCH, CRA	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•	Application No. Appli		pplicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Group Art Unit	Group Art Unit	
-The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sh	eet beneath the correspondence	address	
P ri d for Reply				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	TO EXPIRE	MONTH(S) FROM THE M	AILING DATE	
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFf from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by defaute to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by st 	reply within the statutory ult, expire SIX (6) MONTH	minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered the considered the mailing date of this communication.	dered timely. cation .	
Status				
☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on		40.		
☐ This action is FINAL.				
 Since this application is in condition for allowance exce accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 19 			closed in	
Disp sition of Claims		•	•	
☑ Claim(s)/ → Ч	·	is/are pending in the a	pplication.	
Of the above claim(s)		is/are withdrawn from	consideration.	
□ Claim(s)		is/are allowed.	,	
Claim(s) 1→ Claim(s) 1→				
□ Claim(s)		is/are objected to.	•	
□ Claim(s)			on or election	
Application Papers		requirement.		
☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draw	ring Review, PTO-948			
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	• • •			
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are obj	ected to by the Exami	ner.	<i>‡</i>	
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.				
$\hfill\Box$ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.				
Pri rity under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)				
 □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority □ All □ Some* □ None of the CERTIFIED copies of received. 	-	, , , ,		
☐ received. ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Num	nher)			
Teceived in Application No. (Genes Code/Cental Nati				
received in this national stage application from the li				
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
*Certified copies not received:	0	•		
*Certified copies not received: Attachment(s)				
*Certified copies not received:			cation, PTO-152	

. 4

Serial No. 075,209 Art Unit 2882

"

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to provide an adequate written description. Lines 15-17 of page 7 of the specification and claim 1 which specify that blocks 2-5 are of different thickness, contradict figure 2 which illustrates that they are the same thickness.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for the reasons set forth in the objection to the specification.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Lines 15-17 of page 7 of the specification and claim 1 which specify that blocks 2-5 are of different thickness, contradict figure 2 which illustrates that they are the same thickness.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms th basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Serial No. Art Unit

075,209 2882

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Nord et al (6315447). Nord teaches a dual energy phantom comprising a plurality of blocks 16/18/20 having different thicknesses. Lines 49-54 of column 3 explain that one of the blocks may have channels with inserts therein. The metes and bounds of these claims are unclear.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Examiner Church at telephone number (703) 308-4861.

CRAIG E. CHURCH

Craig E Chirch

Senior Examiner ART UNIT 2882